



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,920 | 12/12/2003 | Michael Muller | IBM-001 | 2237 |
| 51835 7590 02/03/2009 IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ 5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752 | | | | |
| | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | JOO, JOSHUA | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2454 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/03/2009 PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/734,920

Applicant(s)

MULLER ET AL.

Examiner

JOSHUA JOO

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9 and 33-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9 and 33-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on 11/17/2008.

Claims 1-6, 9, 33-43 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 9, 33-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant also argued that:

3. (1) The combination of references do not teach or suggest the amended feature of "processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a body capable of receiving message content and email message with a body capable of receiving message content".

4. In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees that the cited references do not suggest or teach the feature. Resnick discloses rules for specifying and interpreting email messages communicated between computer users. The messages that are communicated may comprise a body or may not comprise a body as the body is optional in a message. Resnick provides rules for processing the messages with a body or lacking a body and suggests that such messages are processed by computer users.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 33-34, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. US Publication #2004/0078448 (Malik hereinafter), in view of Beyda, US Patent #7,461,378 (Beyda hereinafter) and Request for Comments: 2822, P. Resnick, April 2001 (previously cited, Resnick hereinafter).

7. As per claim 1, Malik teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the method comprising:
processing email messages with a message body capable of receiving message content; the electronic mail message having a subject line, the subject line of the electronic mail message containing at least one text message (Paragraph 0092. Receive email message. fig. 10A. Subject line.);

receiving from the first user, while the first user has the electronic mail message selected, a command to initiate synchronous communications with a second user (Paragraphs 0092; 0095. User launches IM chat session from the email message.);

converting, in response to the command from the first user, the electronic mail message into a synchronous communications format that includes each text message contained in the subject line of the electronic mail message (Paragraph 0094. Include content of the subject as part of the IM chat session.);
and

initiating, in response to the command from the first user, synchronous communications between the first and second users to present each text message contained in the subject line of the converted electronic mail message to the first and second users in the synchronous communications format (Paragraphs 0092; 0095. Initiate IM session with contact.).

8. Malik does not specifically teach of processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message body capable of receiving message content. Malik teaches of receiving an electronic mail message but does not specifically teach of converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into a body-less electronic mail message. Malik teaches of converting the

electronic mail message into a synchronous communication but does not specifically teach that the electronic mail message is a body-less electronic mail message.

9. Beyda teaches of converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into an electronic mail message (col. 6, lines 17-21. Instant message converted into an email message.)

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to convert a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into an electronic mail message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Beyda's teachings would improve Malik's teachings by enabling the processing of instant messages according to the preference of senders and/or receivers (col. 5, lines 30-35).

11. Malik and Beyda do not specifically teach of processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message body capable of receiving message content. Malik and Beyda teach of converting a synchronous communication into an electronic mail message but not specifically into a body-less electronic mail message. Malik and Beyda teach of converting an electronic mail message into a synchronous communication but not specifically teach that the electronic mail message is a body-less electronic mail message.

12. Resnick suggests of processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message body capable of receiving message content (Abstract. Messages sent between computer users. Sections 1.1; 2.1; 3.5. Message may or may not comprise a body.).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to process body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message body capable of receiving message content, and for the electronic mail messages as taught by the suggested system to comprise a body-less electronic mail message as taught by Resnick. The motivation

for the suggested combination is that Resnick's teachings would improve the suggested system by specifying a standard for transmitting messages that includes customizing of messages.

14. As per claim 42, Malik teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the method comprising:

receiving electronic email message by a user over the network (Paragraph 0092. Receive email message. fig. 10A. Subject line.); and

automatically converting, in response to a command from the user, the body-less electronic mail message into a synchronous electronic communication (Paragraph 0094. Include content of the subject as part of the IM chat session.).

15. Malik does not specifically disclose of converting a first synchronous electronic communication into a body-less electronic mail message, the body-less electronic mail message having a subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content, the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message transmitting during the first synchronous communication. Malik teaches of receiving an electronic email message but not specifically the body-less electronic email message.

16. Beyda teaches of converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into an electronic mail message (col. 6, lines 17-21. Instant message converted into an email message.)

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to convert a first synchronous electronic communication into a electronic mail message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Beyda's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the processing of instant messages according to the preference of senders and/or receivers (col. 5, lines 30-35).

18. Malik and Beyda teach of converting a first synchronous electronic communication into an electronic mail message but not specifically a body-less electronic mail message. Malik teaches of receiving the electronic email message but does not specifically teach that the electronic email message is the body-less electronic email message.

19. Resnick teaches of receiving a body-less electronic email message having a subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content (Abstract. Messages sent between computer users. Sections 1.1; 2.1; 3.5. Message may or may not comprise a body.).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the electronic mail message that is converted from a synchronous electronic communication as taught by the suggested system to comprise a body-less electronic mail message having a subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content; and to receive the body-less electronic mail message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Resnick's teachings would improve the suggested system by specifying a standard for transmitting messages that includes sending of customized of messages.

21. As per claim 43, Malik substantially teaches the invention as claimed including a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the method comprising:

converting a first electronic mail message into a synchronous electronic communication, the first body-less electronic mail message having a subject line, the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message (Paragraphs 0092; 0095. User launches IM chat session from the email message. Paragraph 0094. Include content of the subject as part of the IM chat session.);

receiving the synchronous electronic communication by a user over the network (Paragraphs 0092; 0095. Initiate IM session with contact.); and

22. Malik does not specifically teach that the first electronic mail message is a body-less electronic mail message lacking a message a body capable of receiving message. Malik also does not specifically teach of automatically converting, in response to a command from the user, the synchronous electronic communication into a second body-less electronic mail message, the second body-less electronic mail message having a subject line containing the at least one text message of the first electronic mail message and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content.

23. Beyda teaches of automatically converting, in response to a command from a user, a synchronous electronic communication into an electronic mail message (col. 6, lines 17-21. Instant message converted into an email message.)

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to automatically convert, in response to a command from a user, a synchronous electronic communication into an electronic mail message as taught by Beyda. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Beyda's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the processing of instant messages according to the preference of senders and/or receivers (col. 5, lines 30-35). Furthermore, Malik teaches of a process of copying text message from a subject of an electronic mail message into a synchronous message during conversion of the electronic mail message into a synchronous message. During a reverse process of converting a synchronous message electronic mail message as taught by Beyda, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reverse Malik's process to copy some text message from the instant message to a subject of an electronic mail message, which would provide some type of descriptive information to enable a user to identify the electronic mail message.

25. Malik and Beyda teach of converting a first electronic mail message but does not specifically teach that the first electronic mail message is a first body-less electronic mail message having a subject line and lacking a message a body capable of receiving message. Malik and Beyda also teach of

converting the synchronous electronic communication into a second electronic mail message but do not specifically teach that the second electronic mail message is a second body-less electronic mail message

26. Resnick teaches of a body-less electronic email message having a subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content (Sections 1.1; 2.1; 3.5. Message may or may not comprise a body.).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the first electronic mail message and the second electronic mail message as taught by the suggested system to comprise a body-less electronic email message having a subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content as taught by Resnick. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Resnick's teachings would improve the suggested system by specifying a standard for transmitting messages that includes sending of customized of messages.

28. As per claim 2, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, wherein the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message includes one or more other text messages taken from a subject line of a previous body-less electronic mail message.

29. Resnick teaches of the subject line of an body-less message including one or more other text messages taken from a subject line of a previous body-less electronic mail message (Section 3.6.5. Subject field may start with "Re:" followed by subject of original message.).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subject line of the electronic mail message as taught by Malik to include one or more other text messages taken from a subject line of a previous body-less electronic mail message as taught by Resnick. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Resnick's teachings would

improve the suggested system by allowing a recipient to identify whether the electronic mail is regarding a previously discussed topic.

31. As per claim 3, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught of a body-less electronic mail message. Malik does not specifically teach wherein the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message includes one or more text messages taken from a chat conversation converted into a format of a body-less electronic mail message.

32. Beyda teaches of converting a chat conversation into the format of an electronic mail message (col. 6, lines 17-21. Instant message converted into an email message.)

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to convert chat conversation into the format of an electronic mail message as taught by Beyda. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Beyda's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the processing of instant messages according to the preference of senders and/or receivers. Furthermore, Malik teaches of a process of copying text message from a subject of an electronic mail message into a synchronous message during conversion of the electronic mail message into a synchronous message. During a reverse process of converting a synchronous message electronic mail message as taught by Beyda, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the process to copy a text message from the instant message to a subject of an electronic mail message, which would enable a user to identify the electronic mail message.

34. As per claim 5, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught the method of claim 1. Malik, Resnick, and Beyda further teach the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving the body-less electronic mail message over the network, displaying the body-less electronic mail message on a display screen as a line item in a mailbox view having a column for the subject line, and displaying on the display screen a scroll

bar arrow at one end of the subject line column, when a cursor is positioned over the subject column of the line item, for horizontally scrolling through the contents of the subject line (fig. 9. Window comprises a horizontal scroll bar at the end of the subject column for scrolling across the columns.).

35. As per claim 9, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught of receiving the body-less electronic message. Malik, Resnick, and Beyda further teach of the method of claim 1, further comprising displaying on a user interface a chat-like graphical window for engaging in synchronous chat in response to receiving the body-less electronic mail message over the network (fig. 10B; paragraph 0094. IM chat window.).

36. As per claim 33, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught the method of claim 1 of receiving the body-less electronic mail message. Malik, Resnick, and Beyda further teach the method comprising giving the first user an option to reply to the received body-less electronic mail message with an electronic mail message having a body (Paragraph 0087. User may select email reply button.).

37. As per claim 34, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught the method of claim 1. Malik further teaches the method comprising automatically generating a body-less electronic mail message when the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received body-less electronic mail message (Paragraph 0070; 0087. User may select email reply button. Compose new email. A new email would lack content in the body.).

38. As per claim 41, Malik teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving, by the first user, synchronous communications from the second user (Paragraph 0094. IM chat messages between user and contact.); receiving, from the first user, a command to initiate asynchronous communications with the second user (Paragraph 0070. Compose new email to a contact.). Malik does not specifically teach of converting, in response to the command to initiate asynchronous communications, the received

synchronous communications into a second body-less electronic mail message; and transmitting the second body-less electronic mail message to the second user over the network.

39. Beyda teaches of converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into an electronic mail message in response to a user command and transmitting the second electronic mail message to the second user over the network (col. 6, lines 17-21. Instant message converted into an email message.).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for a body-less email message as taught by the suggested system to be an email message converted from a synchronous communication in response to a user command and transmit the body-less email message to a user over the network. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Beyda's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the processing of instant messages according to the preference of senders and/or receivers.

41. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, in view of Whittle et al. US Publication #2005/0050462 (Whittle hereinafter).

42. As per claim 4, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught the method of claim 1. Malik further teach the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving the body-less electronic mail message over the network, displaying the body-less electronic mail message on a display screen as a line item in a mailbox view (fig. 9). Malik does not specifically teach of displaying on the display screen an entire content of the subject line when a cursor is positioned over a subject column of the line item.

43. Whittle teaches of positioning a pointer over a text to cause the entire partition of the text to be displayed (abstract; paragraph 0023).

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a system wherein positioning a pointer over a text, such as text of a subject line, causes the entire portion of the text to be displayed. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Whittle's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing users to efficiently view content and optimize the use of space on a window (Paragraph 0020; 0022).

45. Claims 6, 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, in view of Yong, US Patent #6,963,904 (Yong hereinafter).

46. As per claim 6, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising inserting a delimiter into the subject line to separate the text message from a previous text message currently included in the subject line.

47. Yong teaches of placing a delineator in the subject (col. 1, lines 40-56. Insert "RE:").

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to insert a delineator by an email client or typing a user by a user to separate a previous text message in the subject and a text message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Yong's teachings would improve user-friendliness and efficiency by allowing a recipient to know whether the electronic mail is regarding a previously discussed topic and allowing separation of content.

49. As per claim 35, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 34, further comprising automatically placing a delineator between a text message presently in the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message when the first user receives the body-less electronic mail message and a text message subsequently added to the subject line after the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received body-less electronic mail message.

50. Yong teaches of automatically placing a delineator after the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received electronic mail message (col. 1, lines 40-56. Insert "RE:").

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to automatically place a delineator in the subject line as taught by Yong of the body-less electronic mail message as taught by suggested system after the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received body-less electronic mail message in order to separate a previous text message with a subsequently added text message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Yong's teachings would improve user-friendliness and efficiency by allowing a recipient to know whether the electronic mail is regarding a previously discussed topic and allowing separation of content.

52. As per claim 36, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 35, wherein the delineator includes a carriage return so that the text message subsequently added to the subject line appears on a new line within the subject line.

53. Resnick teaches that a carriage return can be placed in a message including the subject line (section 2.2.3)

54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include a carriage return to the subject line as taught by Resnick so that additional text may appear on a new line. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Resnick's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing additional input of data into a header.

55. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, in view of Zhang et al. US Patent #6,016,478 (Zhang hereinafter).

56. As per claim 37, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising automatically signing each text message in the subject line with an identity of an author of that text message.

57. Zhang teaches a concept of using an email program to incorporate a signature in the subject line of a message that identifies the sender of the message (col. 7, lines 59-65).

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to automatic sign each text message in the subject line with an identity of an author of the text message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Zhang's would improve the suggested system by allowing quick identification of messages.

59. Claims 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, in view of Kalfas, US Publication #2004/0199598 (Kalfas hereinafter).

60. As per claim 38, Malik does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, further comprising presenting to a user an option to choose between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic mail message with a message body.

61. Kalfas teaches of allowing a user to choose between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic mail message with a message body (Paragraph 0034; 0037. User may create an email with complete message in subject, i.e. empty body.).

62. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to allow a user to choose between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic mail message with a message body. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kalfas' teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a

complete message to be placed in the subject and thus eliminating the need for a recipient to open a message.

63. As per claim 40, Malik, Beyda, and Resnick taught the method of claim 1. Malik, Beyda, and Resnick further teach the method comprising: displaying the received body-less electronic mail message on a display screen as a line item in a mailbox view (fig. 9). Malik does not specifically teach of displaying an indicator in association with the line item to identify the line item as a body-less electronic mail message.

64. Kalfas teaches of displaying an indicator in association with the line item to identify the line item as a body-less electronic mail message (Paragraphs 0037; 0038).

65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to display an indicator in association with the line item to identify the line item as a body-less electronic mail message. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kalfas' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing indicator that would eliminate the need to open a message.

66. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, in view of Eason, US Publication #2005/0039028 (Eason hereinafter).

67. As per claim 39, Malik does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, further comprising preventing the first user from deleting content from the subject line of the received body-less electronic mail message.

68. Eason teaches of preventing a recipient from deleting content from the subject line of an electronic mail (Paragraphs 0045; 0046. Write protect the electronic mail).

69. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to prevent a user from deleting content from the subject line in a received electronic mail as taught by Eason such as in a body-less electronic mail as taught by the suggested system. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Eason's teachings would improve the security of the suggested system by preventing altering of the received email.

Conclusion

70. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

71. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

72. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

73. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

74. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454